



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/788,426

03/01/2004

Jacques Dumas

BAYER-0044

4965

23599 7590 04/14/2009  
MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C.  
2200 CLARENDON BLVD.  
SUITE 1400  
ARLINGTON, VA 22201

EXAMINER

ROBINSON, BINTA M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1625

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/14/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



**Detailed Action**

The rejection of claim 23 under 112, first paragraph is withdrawn in light of applicant's cancellation of this claim.

**Revised Rejections**

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 20 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for treating some tumor growth, some cancers, retinopathy, ischemic retinal-vein-occlusion, age related macular degeneration, rheumatoid arthritis, psoriasis, dermatitis herpetiformis, erythema multiforme, bullous pemphigoid, subepidermal blister formation, tuberculosis, Helicobacter pylori infection during peptic ulcer disease, Chaga's disease resulting from Trypanosoma cruzi infection, does not provide enablement for preventing any of the diseases in claim 20, as well as treating all types of tumor growth mediated by raf stated in claim 31 or all of the conditions claimed in claim 20. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

In In re Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (1988), factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, have been described. They are:

Art Unit: 1625

1. the nature of the invention,
2. the state of the prior art,
3. the predictability or lack thereof in the art,
4. the amount of direction or guidance present,
5. the presence or absence of working examples,
6. the breadth of the claims,
7. the quantity of experimentation needed, and
8. the level of the skill in the art.

#### The nature of the invention

The nature of the invention is the treatment and prevention of hyperproliferative-disorders, all cancers, treating or preventing a disease regulated by tyrosine kinase, treating or preventing a disease mediated by the VEGF-induced signal transduction pathway, treating or preventing a disease in a human mammal characterized by abnormal angiogenesis or hyperpermeability processes, treating or preventing retinopathy, ischemic retinal-vein occlusion, retinopathy of prematurity, age-related macular degeneration; rheumatoid arthritis, psoriasis, a bolus disorder associated with subepidermal blister formation, including bullous pemphigoid, effects of Shiga-like Toxin resulting from E. Coli infection, effects of enterotoxin A resulting from Staphylococcus infection, meningococcal infection, and infections from Borrelia burgdorferi, Treponema pallidum, cytomegalovirus, influenza virus, Theiler's encephalomyelitis, and the Human (HIV), treating all cancers, or all hyperproliferative disorders, or treating all diseases regulated by tyrosine kinase or all bolus disorders associated with subepidermal blister formation.

#### **The state of the prior art and the predictability or lack thereof in the art**

The state of the prior art is that it involves screening in vitro and in vivo to determine which compounds exhibit the desired pharmacological activities (i.e. what

Art Unit: 1625

compounds can treat which specific disease). There is no absolute predictability even in view of the seemingly high level of skill in the art. The existence of these obstacles establishes that the contemporary knowledge in the art would prevent one of ordinary skill in the art from accepting any therapeutic or preventive regimen on its face.

The instant claimed invention is highly unpredictable as discussed below:

It is noted that the pharmaceutical art is unpredictable, requiring each embodiment to be individually assessed for physiological activity. In *re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 166 USPQ 18 (CCPA 1970) indicates that the more unpredictable an area is, the more specific enablement is necessary in order to satisfy the statute. In the instant case, the instant claimed invention is highly unpredictable since one skilled in the art would recognize that in regards to therapeutic and preventive effects of all diseases, whether or not the disease is effected by the inhibition of raf kinase signaling pathway would make a difference.

The state of the prior art is that cancer therapy remains highly unpredictable. The various types of cancers have different causative agents, involve different cellular mechanisms, and consequently, differ in treatment protocol.

It has been shown that inhibiting the effect of active ras by inhibiting the raf kinase signaling pathway by administration of deactivating antibodies to raf kinase or by co-expression of dominant negative raf kinase or dominant negative MEK, the substrate of raf kinase, leads to the reversion of transformed cells to the normal growth phenotype. See page 1, lines 20-25 of the specification. Similarly, inhibition of raf kinase by antisense oligodeoxynucleotides has been correlated in vitro and in vivo with

Art Unit: 1625

inhibition of the growth of a variety of human tumor types. See pages 28-20 of the specification. However, because of the complex nature and the multiple growth factors involved in tumor progression, an agent targeting a single pathway may have limited efficacy.

In the absence of a showing of correlation between all the diseases claimed as capable of treatment by the inhibition of raf-kinase pathway, one of skill in the art is unable to fully predict possible results from the administration of the compound of claim 1 due to the unpredictability of the role of the inhibition of raf kinase pathway and all of the diseases claimed.

*The amount of direction or guidance present and the presence or absence of working examples*

The only direction and guidance present in the specification is the treatment of the claimed diseases by for the inhibition of raf kinase pathway. There is no correlation between the inhibition of raf kinase pathway with all of the claimed diseases, i.e. the specification fails to provide guidance as to what diseases are mediated by the inhibition of raf kinase pathway.

**The breadth of the claims**

The breadth of the claims is the treatment of all diseases claimed with the compound of claim 1, the treatment and prevention of hyperproliferative-disorders, all cancers, treating or preventing a disease regulated by tyrosine kinase, treating or preventing a disease mediated by the VEGF-induced signal transduction pathway, treating or preventing a disease in a human mammal characterized by abnormal angiogenesis or hyperpermeability processes, treating or preventing retinopathy,

Art Unit: 1625

ischemic retinal-vein occlusion, retinopathy of prematurity, age related macular degeneration; rheumatoid arthritis, psoriasis, a bolus disorder associated with subepidermal blister formation, including bullous pemphigoid, effects of Shiga-like Toxin resulting from E. Coli infection, effects of enterotoxin A resulting from Staphylococcus infection, meningococcal infection, and infections from Borrelia burgdorferi, Treponema pallidum, cytomegalovirus, influenza virus, Theiler's encephalomyelitis, and the Human (HIV), treating all cancers, or all hyperproliferative disorders, or treating all diseases regulated by tyrosine kinase or all bolus disorders associated with subepidermal blister formation.

**The quantity of experimentation needed**

The quantity of experimentation needed is undue experimentation. One of skill in the art would need to determine what diseases out of all diseases would be benefited by the inhibition of raf-1 kinase pathway and would furthermore then have to determine which of the claimed compounds would provide treatment of the disease.

**The level of the skill in the art**

The level of skill in the art is high. However, due to the unpredictability in the pharmaceutical art, it is noted that each embodiment of the invention is required to be individually assessed for physiological activity by in vitro and in vivo screening to determine which compounds exhibit the desired pharmacological activity and which diseases would benefit from this activity.

Thus, the specification fails to provide sufficient support of the broad use of the compound of the claim 1 for the treatment of any disease. As a result necessitating one

of skill to perform an exhaustive search for which diseases can be treated by what compounds of claim 1 in order to practice the claimed invention.

Genentech Inc. v. Novo Nordisk A/S (CA FC) 42 USPQ2d 1001 , states that “ a patent is not a hunting license. It is not a reward for search , but compensation for its successful conclusion” and “[p]atent protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure of an invention, not for vague intimations of general ideas that may or may not be workable”.

Therefore, in view of the Wands factors and In re Fisher (CCPA 1970) discussed above, to practice the claimed invention herein, a person of skill in the art would have to engage in undue experimentation to test which diseases can be treated by the compound encompassed in the instant claims, with no assurance of success.

Claims 1-13, 15-17, 20, 22, 24-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for using the compounds of formula I with B equal to phenyl, does not reasonably provide enablement for using the compounds of formula I B is naphthyl, pyridinyl optionally substituted as claimed. Compounds made and tested represent the scope of claim 1. The specification does not enable any skilled pharmacologist or physician to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The factors to be considered in making an enablement rejection have been summarized above.

a) Determining if any particular claimed compounds with B is naphthyl, pyridinyl or would be active would require synthesis of the substrate and subjecting it to testing with Applicants' raf -1 biochemical assay. Considering the large number of compounds to



Art Unit: 1625

be made this is a large quantity of experimentation. b) The direction concerning the claimed compounds is found in line pages 93-127 which merely states Applicants' intent to make and use such compounds and at page 129, which states that examples 1-174 showed less than 40% inhibition in the c-Raf biochemical assay. c) In the instant case, none of the working examples contains any compounds with radical B equal to pyridinyl, or naphthyl. d) The nature of the invention is inhibition of raf-1 kinase and treatment of human diseases with Applicants' compounds. This involves physiological activity. The nature of the invention requires an understanding of the raf kinase receptor, the binding activity of small ligands to that receptor, and the ability of those compounds to inhibit this receptor. In view of the unpredictability of receptor binding activity and claimed divergent substituents with varied polarity, size, and polarisability, the skilled physician would indeed question the inclusion of such diverse rings, commensurate in scope with these claims. Also see the MPEP § 2164.03 for enablement requirements in the structure sensitive arts of pharmacology and medicinal chemistry.

e) The six-membered benzene ring of Applicants' working examples 1-174 on pages 93-127 compounds is non-basic. The pyridine ring, of the rejected compounds is strongly basic. The pyridine of the rejected compounds are hydrogen bond acceptors. The benzene ring of Applicants' working examples is not. The pyridine ring of the rejected compounds is  $\pi$ -electron deficient. The benzene ring of Applicants' working examples is not. There is no reasonable basis for the assumption that the myriad of compounds embraced the present formula (I) will all share the same biological properties. The diverse claimed rings are chemically non-equivalent with each other

Art Unit: 1625

and with phenyl and naphthyl rings and there is no basis in the prior art for assuming in the non-predictable art of pharmacology that structurally dissimilar compounds will have such activity, In re Surrey 151 USPQ 724 (compounds actually tested which demonstrated the asserted psychomotor stimulatory and anti-convulsant properties were those having the 3,4-dichlorophenyl substituent at the 2-position on the thiazolidone nucleus not sufficient for enablement of any heterocyclic radical at the same position). In re Fouche, 169 USPQ 429 at 434 (a Markush group including both aliphatic and heterocyclic members not enabled for the use of those compounds within the claim having heterocyclic moieties.) In re CAVALLITO AND GRAY, 127 USPQ 202 (claims covering several hundred thousand possible compounds, of which only thirty are specifically identified in appellants' application, not enabled unless all of the thirty specific compounds disclosed had equal hypotensive potency because that fact would strongly indicate that the potency was derived solely from the basic structural formula common to all of them. A wide variation in such potency would suggest that it was due in part to the added substituents and might be eliminated or even reversed by many of the possible substituents which had not been tried.)

f) The artisan using Applicants' invention to treat diseases with the claimed compounds would be a physician with a MD degree and several years of experience. He would be unaware of how to predict a priori how a changing a heterocyclic ring would affect biological activity. In view of the divergent rings with varied basicity, steric hindrance, and polarisability, the skilled physician would indeed question the inclusion of such fused rings, commensurate in scope with these claims. g) Physiological activity,

Art Unit: 1625

is well-known to be unpredictable, In re Fisher, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970) (contrasting mechanical and electrical elements with chemical reactions and physiological activity). See also In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557, 1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 496, 20 USPQ2d 1438, 1445 (Fed. Cir. 1991). h) The breadth of the claims includes all of millions of compounds of formula (I). Thus, the scope is very broad. The present claims embrace various heterocyclic radicals, which are not art-recognized as equivalent. The specific compounds made are not adequately representative of the compounds embraced by the extensive Markush groups instantly claimed.

MPEP 2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557, 1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here. Thus, undue experimentation will be required to practice Applicants' invention.

**(New rejection)**

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A. In claim 31, the term “raf” is unclear and indefinite. It is unclear as to whether raf kinase is being claimed. Appropriate correction is required.

**Response to Applicant's Remarks**

Applicants also traverse the rejection of claims 1-11, 13-30 regarding the lack of enablement of the compounds where the radical B is other than phenyl. Applicants allege that the examiner has not submitted any evidence to support the lack of enablement rejection. However, this is not so. The examiner stated on page 10 of the last outstanding office action, that to see if compounds wherein B is equal to naphthyl, pyridinyl, or quinolinyl would be active would require a large quantity of experimentation because these compounds would have to be synthesized, and then subjected to Applicant's raf-1 biochemical assay. This experimentation would be undue. Applicant does not synthesize these compounds, nor does the applicant disclose any data regarding the physiological activity of these compounds on the inhibition of raf-1 kinase and the claimed diseases. Additionally, a pyridine ring has different chemical characteristics than a quinolinyl ring or a naphthyl ring or phenyl ring, and therefore, there is no reasonable basis that compounds of formula I claimed with B equal to phenyl will share the same same biological properties as compounds of formula I with B equal to quinolinyl, phenyl or naphthyl. The applicant only points to copending applications wherein the compounds of formula I are claimed wherein B is equal to pyridine – and alleges that these compounds are effective Raf –1 kinase inhibitors. The applicant alleges that examples such as example 24, disclosed in the specification of copending application 09640780, illustrate that urea compounds wherein the moiety B is pyridinyl

Art Unit: 1625

are effective inhibitors of raf and p38. However, these urea compounds are not the compounds of the current invention and differ at the A moiety, wherein in the copending application, the A moiety is isoxazolyl, and in the instant application, A can not be isoxazolyl. Therefore, these compounds in the copending application differ at more than 2 points – at the A and B moieties and are not predictive of the activity of the instant compounds. In copending application 09458014, the compounds that applicants reference also are dissimilar to the instant compounds in that they differ from the instant compounds at the A and B moieties. The A ring in the copending application cannot be any of the A rings in the instant compounds – and the B moiety is pyridinyl and not phenyl. Therefore, are not predictive of the activity of the instant compounds. Additionally, the applicant does not address the efficacy and activity of the claimed compounds when B is other than phenyl or pyridinyl.

Applicant also traverses the 112, first paragraph lack of enablement rejection of the method of treating claim 20 alleging that the activity, dosages and methods of administrations of these compounds were adequately described and alleging that the examiner provides no evidence to dispute the findings of the publications regarding raf kinase. However, this is not so. The examiner stated in the last outstanding office action in the rejection that because of the complex nature and the multiple growth factors involved in tumor progression, an agent targeting a single pathway may have limited efficacy. Furthermore, the rejection also noted that the applicant failed to demonstrate a correlation between the inhibition of raf kinase pathway with all treatment of the claimed diseases. Additionally, it was noted that the state of the prior art is that

Art Unit: 1625

cancer therapy remains highly unpredictable. The various types of cancers and hyperproliferative disorders have different causative agents, involve different cellular mechanisms, and consequently, differ in treatment protocol. Therefore, the applicant has not shown how the current compounds can treat all cancers or hyperproliferative disorders. It also is not established in the art to prevent hyperproliferative disorders or preventing any of the disease in claims 20 and 31

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

/Binta M Robinson/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1625

/Janet L. Andres/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1625